

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 94 23:42:59 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V94 #192
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Tue, 22 Feb 94 Volume 94 : Issue 192

Today's Topics:

Exam element credit - 1 yr.!
htx-202 audio mod (?) (2 msgs)
Jeff Gold
John Ramsey
Looking for HT storage suggestions
Medium range point-to-point digital links
Ramsey HF QRP Rigs
Tone Burst Whistle?
WARNING: Potential Satellite Anomaly Warning - 21 Feb

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 22 Feb 1994 17:33:59 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!
haven.umd.edu!cville-srv.wam.umd.edu!ham@ames.arpa
Subject: Exam element credit - 1 yr.!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

You have ONE YEAR EXACTLY from the date of passing an exam element to use it
for getting a higher class license.

Someone noted that they passed the General written, but haven't passed 13 wpm.
You have exactly 1 year from the date of passing your general exam to pass
the 13 wpm exam (i.e. utilize the General written credit), after which the
written exam credit will expire.

Scott NF3I

I don't remember if it's, for example, Nov. 7, 1993 - Nov. 6, 1994, or
Nov. 7, 1993 - Nov. 7, 1994 (last day inclusive?)

--

73, ----- The
 \ / Long Original
Scott Rosenfeld Amateur Radio NF3I Burtonsville, MD | Live \$5.00
 WAC-CW/SSB WAS DXCC - 123 QSLed on dipoles -----| Dipoles! Antenna!

Date: 21 Feb 94 13:09:50 GMT
From: nprdc!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!utah-morgan!hellgate.utah.edu!
cc.usu.edu!sy_j.pgh.wec.com!user@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: htx-202 audio mod (?)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I recently got an htx202 and since I've been using it, I have gotten
signal reports that my audio is low. someone mentioned that radio
shack will do an audio circuit mod for free if it is under warranty.
anybody here knows what the mod is ? and if it can be done without
taking it to the RS service center which is open only at a very
inconvenient time.

jerry
N3RKD

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 16:07:15 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: htx-202 audio mod (?)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <ah301-210294080950@sy_j.pgh.wec.com> writes:
> I recently got an htx202 and since I've been using it, I have gotten
> signal reports that my audio is low. someone mentioned that radio
> shack will do an audio circuit mod for free if it is under warranty.
> anybody here knows what the mod is ? and if it can be done without
> taking it to the RS service center which is open only at a very
> inconvenient time.
>
> jerry
> N3RKD

Often when I talked to people they were able to guess I was using

an HTX202 based on the audio levels. I took mine to the local repair center, and the tech said mine was about as low as he had seen it. I think it is more like a quick adjustment rather than a mod.

I believe it works better now, because I have asked folks and they say that the audio is sufficient.

By the way, record all of your memory settings. When you get your radio back, its memory will be clear.

--
R i c k C o t t l e
Email:cottle@prism.sps.mot.com

Date: 22 Feb 1994 17:27:58 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!jlw3@ames.arpa
Subject: Jeff Gold
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

David Stockton (dstock@hpqmoca.sqf.hp.com) wrote:

: A somewhat appropriate quote from the bloke who invented the
: geosynchronous satellite:

: *****

: "Any sufficiently advanced technology is indistinguishable from
: magic"

: - Arthur C Clarke

: *****

: The word "sufficiently" is for lawyers to argue over.

: David

There was an episode about this point on a Star Trek TNG sometime back. . .
Not like I'd know, or anything :)

--jessE
(no I don't intentionally capitalize the E, the newsreader does it for me.)

Date: 22 Feb 94 10:16:12 EST
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!
pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!ohstpy.mps.ohio-state.edu!miavx1!miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!
clmorgan@ames.arpa
Subject: John Ramsey
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <rohvm1.mah48d-180294104722@136.141.220.39>, rohvm1.mah48d@rohmmaas.com
(John E. Taylor III) writes:

> In article <CLC8su.DCt@news.direct.net>, kg7bk@indirect.com (Cecil Moore)
> wrote:

>

>>

>> Your experience has been different from mine. I had 100 times the trouble
>> out of Heathkits that I had with Ramsey kits. You probably weren't around
>> for the '50s when it was a miracle if a Heathkit ever worked.

>>

>

> Really?! I've built Heathkits from the original oscilloscope and AT-1
> transmitter right up through their kit 2-m HT, and had _very_ few problems
> that weren't my own stupidity (back in the '50's I was known to make a cold
> solder joint occasionally). Think I had one bad relay in my HW-100 that
> they promptly replaced, can't recall any other problems in well over twenty
> kits.

>

> Only built one Ramsey kit, their 40-m qrp transmitter. Very simple
> circuit, but it doesn't work. (Oscillator stage is okay, but the final
> doesn't amplify.) Haven't had a chance to troubleshoot it yet, so can't
> rule out my own stupidity, but Ramsey doesn't have a good track record with
> me.

>

> --

> 73 de John Taylor W3ZID
> rohvm1.mah48d@rohmmaas.com

I, too, have to disagree with the observation regarding Heathkits. From
back in the 50's (that's 1950s folks) when I built my first one, I'd
never had a problem that wasn't of my own making.

My experience leads me to believe Heathkit (may they RIP) has been unfairly
slammed ... by far, I believe, the Heathkit builders were successful and
had an excellent learning experience.

The kits were developed, and manuals written, not for graduate engineers but
for the folks in the front lines. The number of Heath products in use through

the years, as well as today, certainly attest to the quality of their product.

I've never done a RAMSEY kit, so no comment here.

73 >< Carl
K8NHE

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 17:37:31 GMT
From: agate!headwall.Stanford.EDU!unixhub!unixhub.SLAC.Stanford.EDU!
witness@ames.arpa
Subject: Looking for HT storage suggestions
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Hi. Primarily I'm a disaster service worker who uses ham radio more for need than recreation, so keeping my HT always on my person isn't always the most practical option. Extra bulk, the risk of accidental damage, and infrequent use make it impractical. However, I DO need to keep it within ready reach at all times. One option is my car. My concern about storing it in the trunk of my car (along with my disaster supplies) is the summer heat and sun. I do not know what temperature specifications exist for most HTs (does anyone have any?), but I do know the NiCad batteries are rated up to 45 Celcius for storage. In the summer sun of California, I would think that the trunk of my car could get well over 55 Celcius.

Is this a concern that should keep me from storing an HT in my trunk during the summer months? Anyone have any similar experiences or wisdom to share?

thanks in advance --

73 de KD6QPY

greg

--

witness@slac.stanford.edu -- Provided by the management for your protection

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 17:58:54 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!srngenprp!glenne@ames.arpa
Subject: Medium range point-to-point digital links
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Severe basenote drift acknowledged. (:>)

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

> Arrgh, I knew that. Signal drops with the *square* of distance, so it's
> 6 db per doubling. The 119 db figure is correct though. The biggest loss
> happens in that first mile.

The term "pathloss" can be misleading since in freespace signal isn't lost. Radio waves are divergent. The illuminated area increases as the square of the distance. Focus the power better and you get more in the receiving "bucket". With constant antenna aperture (physical size once you get beyond dipoles) this is more effectively done at shorter wavelengths/higher frequencies.

Signals appear to drop because the aperture of the antenna "catching" it is getting smaller compared to the total illuminated area at $1/D^2$. This is exactly why shorter paths and shorter wavelengths are better.

> I think that my point here is that LOS paths aren't practical for most
> amateur data links. The ability to get LOS paths is very terrain specific,
> and very \$\$\$ specific. They either require fortuitous high sites, or
> very expensive microwave towers.

This is true, but if we are considering "competitive" information systems and networks, something that can hold a candle to 10's or 100's of Kbs *to the user* we have to consider how to efficiently pipe information around. If we can't find a way to make shorter and better quality paths practical, in the end we aren't going to be able to compete with the alternatives.

> I agree it isn't practical to get multi-megabit systems below the
> microwave frequencies. What I think you're overlooking is the physical
> and financial impossibility of building the number of short hops that
> LOS requires in most of the country in order to do the higher rate
> channels. Amateurs can't do like the phone company and put up million
> dollar relay sites every 15-30 miles. The expense isn't in the equipment,
> it's in the *sites*. Amateurs don't have eminent domain, or the financial
> resources of a major public utility. Amateurs are going to have to accept
> lower data rates in order to stretch out the distance between available
> sites enough to make the system practical.

I guess our difference is in what we consider acceptable. I agree that building a network is difficult and costly but I'm of the opinion that if amateur radio is to stay viable and interesting in the sorts of ways it has in the past; public service, emergency and a playground for the "lay" technically inclined, that it has to have something to offer which is at least similar to that which is available elsewhere. I'm not implying that we have to outdo the phone company but that in the information age we had better be able to transfer information reasonably well in contrast to the alternate commercial methods.

I don't see "new blood" being too enamored with a 100 bps to-the-user performance(I'm being charitable, most longhaul amateur datacomm is a good deal slower than this)over AR if 1000 times that is available

elsewhere.

While this isn't quite the case yet, it isn't far off. The "backbone" for the commercial system is constantly improving and a wireless connection to the "last mile" is about to rain on us from a multitude of vendors. I might point out that this backbone is effective because it uses short wavelengths and focussed energy; microwave/millimeterwave terrestrial and satellite networks and the really shortwave/focussed/guided medium: fiber.

> Power is cheap. Sites are few and expensive. We have to be able to use
> the sites *we can get* to build the network. Unlike a public utility,
> we can't just go out and condemn ideal sites where we need them for
> our microwave links. All of our path engineering has to revolve around
> what we can do with the sites we can get.

I agree that sites are of great value. I suppose a geostationary sites would be extremely valuable to amateurs but I don't agree that power is cheap nor really all that effective at making high information volume systems. Once one leaves quality paths, the cost of maintaining quality data flow is tremendous. Not only can't we generate enough power to overcome the additional losses and path variabilities cheaply but the excess power (that which doesn't get wasted in heating up the countryside) goes into removing the channel from reuse by other links (QRM). We need to be finding ways to use *less* power, not more, and not just because of the FCC mandate either.

Access to suitable sites may be one area where amateurs have an advantage over the big service providers. We are at least grass roots and already involved with repeaters and remote bases. Amateurs have a lot of "ins".

Even the big telecom companies haven't been able to write off their huge investments and go out and replace all their old equipment in one fell swoop. If amateurs plan appropriately, we *might* be able to target something which will have value in the years to come. If we don't, I'm afraid that as a hobby, we haven't much hope of staying interesting.

> The link budget calc I did showed that a 90 mile forward scatter path
> has a path loss of 198 db at 219 MHz for a 56 kb bandwidth. That's doable
> with ordinary amateur beams and brick amplifiers, given the sensitivity
> of existing RF modems.
>

> > Your second 21 mile link obviously *isn't* LOS!
>
> Yes it is. We can *see* the antennas at each end.

I probably should have said "quality" instead of LOS. That your shorter

path has more loss than the longer one shows that it has a problem.

> >Local clutter is probably degrading things severely.
> >Antennas help a lot (2 dB of system improvement per dB of antenna gain)
> >but a poor path degrades things much faster than antennas can fix it.
> > That "nestled end" that you call line-of-sight is clearly far from it.
> >See my comment above about most practical links losing 15-40 dB as
>
> The problem we have is severe multipath because the beamwidth of our
> antennas illuminates buildings on either side of the path. That same

That's what I meant by "local clutter". And notice that throwing power at it in the situation probably doesn't fix it if the problem is multipath.

> path *does* work at 7 GHz because we have a commercial link there using
> 6 foot dishes at each end that does not suffer multipath. The narrower
> beam doesn't illuminate the multipath generating reflectors.

And that points out part of the value of microwave, small antennas give you a more focussed beam. The 7 GHz system probably can run a good deal less transmitter power and at the same time provide more opportunity for reuse of the channel because it doesn't spray power so widely.

> Well I agree we can't compete with the phone company. Their resources
> are vastly greater than anything we could muster. But we can do a *lot*
> better than 1200 baud for our users. And *that* horribly slow speed has

I doubt that we can provide simultaneous 1200 bps to-the-user for even a small fraction of US amateurs with a network of 56 kbps links at VHF. And to date, very few users have seen anything near 1200 bps *throughput* with the most common system.

> been enough to interest 20% of our ham population sufficiently to make
> packet their primary operating mode, and has been enough to get hundreds
> of high site nodes and digis installed around the country. With those sites
> in hand, we can do a pretty good job of upgrading the network to 56 kb.
> That's a 47 times improvement over what we've got. We can do that for
> about \$8 each per year from active packeteers, and a lot of volunteer
> labor.

I hope you are right that such a network could maintain interest in AR, but I guess I don't believe it. Not if someone potentially interested can get inexpensive worldwide connectivity with high throughput and a host of services and if wireless connection to all this is also economical. Once there is fiber to the home, things just get worse for a lowspeed, RF-bound system.

> The highest traffic flows are on the user MANs. In some cases where

> local topographic conditions permit, those MANs could be shifted to
> higher speed. But for the intercity trunks, I don't think we can do

Higher speed cluster access was the point of our Hubmaster protocol (ARRL CNC #9). And it may be that social and other common interest issues keep the highest information volume local. However, even if the backbones don't have to be orders of magnitude faster than the local channels, the local channels have to be fast enough to be "interesting". This isn't going to happen with a small amount of VHF spectrum in most urban areas (if interested, see my other paper in CNC #9). With realizable antennas, the beamwidths are going to be wide and the available channel speed will be divided among the users. Very rapidly, a busy 56kbps channel becomes slower than a quiet 1200 bps channel. A highspeed link does not a highspeed network make.

> megabit microwave trunks nationwide. There are just too many miles
> where there are no hams, and no suitable sites for the asking. Current
> inter-MAN traffic demand doesn't justify it even if we could do it,
> but I suspect that "build it and they will come" would be in effect
> if we could possibly do it. I just don't see any way we could get
> the sites. Even if the telcos *gave* us their old microwave sites,
> I don't think we could find the manpower to maintain them.

I don't have an answer either except that perhaps a few geostationary transponders could do a lot for long haul and perhaps mitigate the problem. In any case, we *must* make effective use of resources if we are to pull it off. This means efficient energy/information transfer which is going to require focussed beams and/or guided waves. This simply isn't going to be possible at VHF.

It may be that AR will have to use existing carriers, like the IP encapsulation presently done using the Internet, for long haul. I'm not sure that in the longterm I can identify the value added by amateur radio if this trend is taken to the limit. In any case, I think there is no question that we are going to have to coordinate and cooperate. This is why I would hate to see a plan which falls short of the necessary minimum required to succeed.

I guess I'm changing my mind about what "build it and they will come" means in AR. I'm afraid it means:

build it all, everything in place to provide highspeed user access worldwide,
user access h/w, s/w and a host of free services and applications.

offer it for "less than you can imagine" (certainly less than the XYL pain-threshold of \$500 or so), available by charge card from all the mail order suppliers

make it totatally turnkey, there must be no way for the user to mess it up and they will come. They will complain that it was done wrong, doesn't work well enough, is a ripoff and they could have done it better. *but* they will come and use it.

My apologies to the original poster for this severe drift. I'll QRT now.

73

Glenn n6gn

Date: 22 Feb 1994 15:33:26 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!math.ohio-state.edu!news.acns.nwu.edu!
casbah.acns.nwu.edu!rdewan@ames.arpa
Subject: Ramsey HF QRP Rigs
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <CLJx9F.2tH@news.direct.net>,
Cecil Moore <kg7bk@indirect.com> wrote:
>>Now, have you, Cecil, or anyone else, built any of Ramsey's HF QRP xmtrs?
>>For \$30 I might get one of those pup's for 20M (but from what I hear I
>>think a low pass filter might be in order).
>>
>>73, Jeff NH6IL
>
>No, Jeff, I haven't built one and don't know anyone who has but, like you,
>would be interested in hearing from anyone who has.

I did not build one, but I debugged and fixed one for a friend who could not get it to work. And for good reasons.

The receiver is a knock-off of the Neophyte Receiver from QST. The air variable in the VFO is replaced by a reverse biased 1N4002. It is unstable and drifts like crazy.

The transmitter is a knock-off of W7ZOI's universal qrp tx with 'Ramsey special' mods. The L-C tuned interstage coupling, which required toroids, has been replaced by broadband r-c coupling. The problem: parasitics galore. It took a lot of work to get it tamed and put out a reasonable amount of power.

My one thought as I debugged and fixed these kits was: The mods were to reduce component cost, never mind the effect on performance.

Sort of sums up my opinion of Ramsey kits.

```
Rajiv                               dit 1  dit
aa9ch                               1
r-dewan@nwu.edu ***** =
                * rajiv aa9ch/m * =
                * r-dewan @nwu.edu * 1
                * iambic cmos super2 * 1
                ***** kwd ts50 tx bugcatcher * 1
                * *1
                * *** *H
                * * * * *H
                base* *kenwd850*vert*80mloop* *kent**
                *** ***
```

Date: 22 Feb 94 10:06:03 EST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!cis.ohio-state.edu!
pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!ohstpy.mps.ohio-state.edu!miavx1!miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!
clmorgan@ames.arpa
Subject: Tone Burst Whistle?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <T95sHc5w165w@stat.com>, david@stat.com (David Dode11) writes:
> I have an ICOM 24AT which I would like to use with tone burst. Is there
> a way to do this easily?
>
> I understand that someone sells a tone-burst whistle which immitates the
> tone to prevent internal modification of a radio.
>
> Anyone heard or know where I can get one of these?
>
> david
>
> ---
> Editor, HICNet Medical Newsletter
> Internet: david@stat.com FAX: +1 (602) 451-1165
> Bitnet : ATW1H@ASUACAD

Back in the "good-ole-days", we made whistles from short (approx 4") lengths of brass tubing. Sometimes the tubing could be salvaged from a VHF or UHF antenna; sometimes acquired from a hobby shop. ID, as I recall, was 0.25".

A notch cut in the side, approx 1.5" from one end, and final "trimming" of the tube, acquired the desired tone. (In the order of 1800Hz, I think)

Worked pretty well ... considering the investment ... but did take some practice to become competent.

Have fun!

73 >< Carl
K8NHE

Date: Sun, 20 Feb 1994 23:56:44 MST
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!library.ucla.edu!news.mic.ucla.edu!unixg.ubc.ca!nntp.cs.ubc.ca!alberta!adec23!ve6mgs!usenet@ames.arpa
Subject: WARNING: Potential Satellite Anomaly Warning - 21 Feb
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\

POT

ISSUED: 06:00 UT, 21 FEBRUARY

/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\/\

ATTENTION:

Protons at greater than 10 MeV are becoming fairly significantly enhanced at the present time. Flux levels are presently continuing to increase. New maximums are continually being set. Protons at greater than 10 MeV are presently at 570 pfu at 06:05 UTC. Some contamination of the x-ray sensors is presently being observed on-board the GOES-6 and GOES-7 spacecraft. Other anomalies may be also observed during this satellite proton event. This proton event is not particularly hard, spectrally. Most of the particles have energies below 50 MeV.

An interplanetary shock, related to the flare which was responsible for this proton activity, is expected to arrive late in the UTC day of 21 February or (preferably) early in the UTC day of 22 February. There is a fair possibility geosynchronous satellites may observe periods of magnetopause crossings for several hours after the arrival of this shock.

Also by way of update, the high energy electron fluxes (and fluences) at greater than 2 MeV which have been observed over the last two weeks have dropped and are continuing to gradually fall.

** End of Warning **

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 15:56:15 GMT
From: agate!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <1994Feb3.190229.8136@arrl.org>, <x8yqthx.jramsey@delphi.com>,
<POPOVICH.94Feb21022855@prince.cs.columbia.edu>
Subject : Re: RAMSEY FX TRANSCEIVER

Steve Popovich (popovich@prince.cs.columbia.edu) wrote:

: Jeff, I'm afraid you've gone 'round the bend here. This kind of
: argument went out with McCarthy, didn't it? I think you're a bit
: overzealous in desiring to {pro,per}secute "suspected illegals", too.
: Now I guess I'm one of your suspects too, even though I am not now,
: nor have I ever been, involved with pirate radio. :-)

Now if you would please just provide the names of all those you know who
are or have, in the past, been involved with pirate radio, we can probably
clear your name and allow you to reclaim your good name. What? We know
better than that, if you didn't know any pirates would you really be
commenting on this thread? Please just tell us what you know and
everything will be alright. All we need are a couple of names, don't
woory they'll be given the same opportunity as you to clear their names.

dan

--

* Daniel D. Todd Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa *
* Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu *
* Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102 *
* Davis CA 95616 *

* The only thing I can officially say for the University is: *
* What I say is in no way related to oficial University policy *

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 16:05:15 GMT
From: olivea!isc-br!loki!bruceo@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <HPaZHc3w165w@stat.com>, <steve.761771155@netsys.com>,
<1994Feb22.122512.18239@afit.af.mil>
Subject : Passed General written, how long do I have to pass code?

I passed my General written exam a while back, but was only able to
copy 5 wpm.

Does anyone know how long I have to pass the 13 wpm before I have to
take the written exam over again?

Thanks....

bruceo@loki.isc-br.com
N7RWO
--

Bruce Oscarson		bruceo@mail.spk.olivetti.com
Olivetti North America		
N7RWO		ma-bell (509) 927-5437

Date: 22 Feb 1994 17:25:17 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!wupost!bigfoot.wustl.edu!cec3!j1w3@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2k0eup\$k3o@crcnis1.unl.edu>,
<rcrw90-180294093408@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,
<2kcdqj\$nto@crcnis1.unl.edu>
Subject : Re: Keyboards at testing sessions

Gary McDuffie Sr (mcduffie@unlinfo.unl.edu) wrote:
: rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

: >The need is not to show that someone *is* or *could* cheat, but for them to
: >prove that they *could not* cheat.. If you want to use some piece of
: >equipment in a testing session *you* must show that (a) you are not using
: >it to cheat and (b) it won't disturb the other test takers.

: Oh, we are back to guilty_until_proven_innocent now? Be real!

How about, "prevention is the best medicine"??? If you be sure that a person
can't cheat, he most likely won't. I'm quite aware of this as a student full
time; I've been told at the MCAT, for example, although there are physics

and chemistry problems, calculators are not allowed, watches are not allowed that make any noise whatsoever, including beeping at the hour. You are not considered guilty, but they want to preclude the possibilities of any cheating. This is the whole purpose of proctors, or VE's. I've gone to things like math contests, where I had to demonstrate that my programmable calculator was empty, i.e., reset it, and let the proctors see the prompt, "reset ok."

: >Showing an empty hard drive or none at all is one very easy way to do this.
: > Certainly there are other ways to do this. Remember the onus is not on the
: > VEs to try to anticipate every possible way for someone to cheat, but to
: > ensure fair tests

: You failed to answer the question. What has a hard drive got to do
: with cheating? How is a hard drive going to help you cheat?

Somebody may say that you can have a program hooked to a mic that copies code. There are definitely those that can do so, given the proper audio input. Now the chances of someone doing that *is* slim, but still the possibility exists.

All in MHO, and the institution can (disclaimer) think anything; whether or not it is what I do is purely coincidental.

--jessE

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 14:53:20 GMT
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!gatech!wa4mei.ping.com!ke4zv!gary@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2970520692.0.p01258@psilink.com>,
<1994Feb17.144029.3459@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>, <CLL8pn.LAM@cscsun.rmc.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: Keyboards at testing sessions

In article <CLL8pn.LAM@cscsun.rmc.edu> dtiller@cscsun.rmc.edu (David Tiller) writes:

>Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

>: Or bring in your Royal or Smith Corona portable typewriter. Even the FCC

>: allowed you to copy by mill back in the 1960s.

>

>I agree in principle, but wouldn't that be a little loud and distracting

>for the others? A pc keyboard is loud enough! How about cheating? What

>would stop a dishonest person from peering at the keyboard as the characters

>were typed?? Inquiring minds, and all that....

Well in my experience, the FCC had their Instructograph's volume turned up so loud a hundred manual typewriters couldn't have drowned it out. It un-nerved me to hear it echoing down the hall. They'd also let you use cans if you brought your own, and your own key for the sending test too. (Wish I'd known that in advance, their key sucked.)

As for cheating by watching someone's fingering of their keyboard, I'd never thought of that. Seems to me that would take as much practice as just conditioning yourself to copy the Code.

Gary

--

Gary Coffman KE4ZV		You make it,		gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems		we break it.		uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way		Guaranteed!		emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244				

Date: Tue, 22 Feb 1994 05:04:15 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu!jherman@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <2jqtlTINNkan@abyss.West.Sun.COM>, <CLJo0C.9t6@news.Hawaii.Edu>, <rcrw90-210294094730@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>
Subject : Re: Jef Harmon (was Re: RAMSEY FX TRANSCEIVER

In article <rcrw90-210294094730@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>
rcrw90@email.mot.com (Mike Waters) writes:

>

>I have to wonder if there is a living person who's past Jef *doesn't*
>suspect?

>

>How is your potty patrol going Jeff? Still finding nasty people
>misbehaving in the bathrooms at U of H?

Who's Jef?

Yeah, those 'guys' are still passing their diseases to each other in the restrooms on campus. The campus police are finally starting to arrest them for lewd conduct and solicitation.

I guess I should have put a smiley or two in the rec.radio.pirate post. I really don't believe that Dana has ever done anything illegal. Him and I will never see eye-to-eye on some things.

QRT. dit dit

73 Mike,
Jeff NH6IL

End of Info-Hams Digest V94 #192
